

1 Karma M. Julianelli (SBN 184175)  
2 karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com  
**BARTLIT BECK LLP**  
3 1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200  
4 Denver, Colorado 80202  
5 Telephone: (303) 592-3100

6 Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)  
7 hnam@kaplanfox.com  
**KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**  
8 850 Third Avenue  
9 New York, NY 10022  
10 Tel.: (212) 687-1980

11 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re*  
12 *Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

13 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice*)  
14 steve@hbsslaw.com  
**HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**  
15 1301 Second Ave., Suite 2000  
16 Seattle, WA 98101  
17 Telephone: (206) 623-7292

18 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re*  
19 *Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and*  
20 *Attorneys for Pure Sweat Basketball, Inc.*

21 Bonny E. Sweeney (SBN 176174)  
22 bsweeney@hausfeld.com  
**HAUSFELD LLP**  
23 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200  
24 San Francisco, CA 94104  
25 Telephone: (415) 633-1908

26 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re*  
27 *Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and*  
28 *Attorneys for Peekya App Services, Inc.*

29 [Additional counsel appear on signature page]

30 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)  
31 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com  
**FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH**  
32 **LLP**  
33 Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor  
34 San Francisco, CA 94111  
35 Telephone: (415) 591-7500

36 Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)  
37 cvarney@cravath.com  
**CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**  
38 825 Eighth Avenue  
39 New York, New York 10019  
40 Telephone: (212) 474-1000

41 *Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in Epic*  
42 *Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*

43 Brian C. Rocca (221576)  
44 brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
45 One Market, Spear Street Tower  
46 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
47 Telephone: (415) 442-1000

48 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

2 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

3 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

4

5 **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE**  
6 **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

7 Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

8 **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT**  
**STATEMENT**

9 Date: February 18, 2021

10 Time: 10:00 a.m.

11 Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor (via Zoom)

12 Judge: Hon. James Donato

1 Pursuant to this Court’s Order dated February 11, 2021, setting a status conference for  
 2 February 18, 2021 (ECF No. 2), the parties in the above-captioned MDL action (the “Parties”), by  
 3 and through their undersigned counsel, submit this Joint Case Management Statement.

4 **I. CASE STATUS SUMMARY**

5 **MDL Transfer Order.** On February 5, 2021, the United States Judicial Panel on  
 6 Multidistrict Litigation issued a Transfer Order (ECF No. 1) creating the centralized action *In re*  
 7 *Google Play Store Antitrust Litigation*, No. 3:21-md-02981-JD (“*Play Store MDL*”). The *Play*  
 8 *Store MDL* is comprised of (A) one individual action; (B) one consolidated developer class action;  
 9 (C) one consolidated consumer class action (all three of (A)-(C) have already been pending before  
 10 this Court); and (D) six new tagalong consumer class action cases transferred to this Court from  
 11 other District Courts. The details of these cases are as follows:

- 12 A. *Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD (“*Epic*”), the  
 13 only individual action;
- 14 B. Two Developer class actions pending before this Court and previously consolidated  
 15 as *In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD  
 16 (“*Developer Class Action*”):
  - 17 (1) *Pure Sweat Basketball, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-  
 18 JD; and
  - 19 (2) *Peekya App Services, Inc. v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-06772-JD;
- 20 C. Eight consumer class actions pending before this Court and consolidated as *In re*  
 21 *Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD  
 22 (“*Consumer Class Action*”):
  - 23 (1) *Carr, et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD;
  - 24 (2) *Bentley v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-07079-JD;
  - 25 (3) *McNamara v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-07361-JD;

- 1 (4) *Herrera v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-07365-JD;
- 2 (5) *Carroll v. Google LLC*, Case No. 3:20-07379-JD;
- 3 (6) *Esquivel v. Alphabet*, Case No. 3:20-cv-8337-JD;
- 4 (7) *Roberts v. Google*, Case No. 3:20-cv-7824-JD; and
- 5 (8) *Kavulak v. Google*, Case No. 3:20-cv-09421-JD.

6 D. Six tagalong consumer class actions that were transferred or conditionally  
7 transferred from other District Courts by the JPML<sup>1</sup>:

- 8 (1) *Paige v. Google LLC*, Case No. 1:20-03158 (D.D.C.) (transferred);
- 9 (2) *McCready v. Google LLC*, Case No. 20-03556 (D.D.C.) (conditionally  
10 transferred);
- 11 (3) *Blumberg v. Google LLC*, Case No. 20-03557 (D.D.C.) (conditionally  
12 transferred);
- 13 (4) *Ratliff v. Google LLC*, Case No. 20-00833 (S.D. Miss.) (conditionally  
14 transferred);
- 15 (5) *Black v. Google LLC*, Case No. 21-00077 (E.D. Mo.) (conditionally  
16 transferred); and
- 17 (6) *Alexander v. Google LLC*, Case No. 21-00018 (E.D. Va.) (conditionally  
18 transferred).

19 This Court has been coordinating various Google Play-related actions for several months.

20 The Court appointed Interim Lead Class Counsel for both the *Consumer Class Action* and the  
21 *Developer Class Action*. The Parties negotiated a Protective Order, ESI Order, and Discovery  
22 Coordination Order, which were subsequently entered. The Parties have served and responded to  
23 discovery requests, commenced document productions, and Plaintiffs continue to meet and confer

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> *Paige* was formally transferred per the JPML's order. With respect to the five other tagalongs, the deadline for  
26 objecting to the JPML's conditional transfer order expired on February 16, 2021 and the JPML lifted the temporary  
27 stay of that order on February 17, 2021. The parties will report any further developments at the status conference.

1 with Google related to various discovery issues, including Google's and Epic's search protocols,  
 2 date ranges for production, requests about regulatory investigations, transactional and financial  
 3 data requests, a proposed mutual validation protocol, and searches related to named consumer  
 4 plaintiffs' individual devices and accounts. The parties will comply with the Court's standing  
 5 orders if any of their discovery disputes reach impasse.

6 A Stipulation and [Proposed] Scheduling Order and Page Limits for Forthcoming Motion  
 7 Practice was filed with the Court (*Epic*, ECF No. 87; *Consumer Class Actions*, ECF No. 71;  
 8 *Developer Class Actions*, ECF No. 68) and is pending approval. The Parties request entry of the  
 9 stipulated case schedule. Developer and Consumer Plaintiffs maintain that the schedule will  
 10 require prompt resolution of on-going discovery issues and prompt production of necessary  
 11 documents, particularly transactional data, to meet the current August 2021 class certification  
 12 deadline.

13 *Paige* and recently-filed tagalong consumer actions from other districts have not advanced  
 14 beyond the pleadings stage. Those complaints rely on nearly identical factual allegations, assert  
 15 the same legal theories and seek the same relief as the *Consumer Class Action* already pending  
 16 before this Court. As such, the six tagalong consumer cases from other district courts should  
 17 simply be consolidated with the *Consumer Class Action*, as the Court has done for other "related"  
 18 consumer cases filed in this District, and all tagalong plaintiffs join in the currently filed  
 19 Consolidated Consumer Amended Complaint. The Consumer Plaintiffs also request that the court  
 20 enter an order directing that any future MDL cases will be automatically related to the *Consumer*  
 21 *Class Action*.

22 **Court Filings.** Subject to the Court's approval, the parties propose filing all new  
 23 documents on the MDL case docket (3:21-md-02981-JD). In addition, documents related to the  
 24 Epic action would be filed on the docket for Case No 3:20-cv-05671-JD; documents related to the  
 25 Consumer Class Action would be filed on the docket for Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD; and

26

27

28

1 documents related to the Developer Class Action would be filed on the docket for Case No. 3:20-  
 2 cv-05792-JD.

3 **Court’s Prior Orders.** The Parties request the Court adopt the following orders as  
 4 governing the *Play Store MDL*:

- 5 A. Protective Order (*Epic*, ECF No. 106-1; *Consumer Class Action*, ECF No. 109-1;  
 6 *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 76-1);
- 7 B. ESI Order (*Epic*, ECF No. 88; *Consumer Class Action*, ECF No. 72; *Developer*  
 8 *Class Action*, ECF No. 69); and
- 9 C. Discovery Coordination Order (*Epic*, ECF No. 89; *Consumer Class Action*, ECF  
 10 No. 73; *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 70); and
- 11 D. the Stipulation and [Proposed] Scheduling Order and Page Limits for Forthcoming  
 12 Motion Practice (*Epic*, ECF No. 87; *Consumer Class Action*, ECF No. 71;  
 13 *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 68).

14 **Google’s Motions to Dismiss.** Google filed its opening brief in support of its motion to  
 15 dismiss *Epic* and the *Developer Class Action* on November 13, 2020. (*Epic*, ECF No. 91;  
 16 *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 71). Plaintiffs filed their opposition on December 21, 2020  
 17 (*Epic*, ECF No. 111; *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 81), and Google filed its reply on January  
 18 20, 2021 (*Epic*, ECF No. 117; *Developer Class Action*, ECF No. 95). In its February 11, 2021  
 19 Order, the Court vacated the hearing date previously set for Google’s Motion and stated the  
 20 February 18, 2021 status conference would be used to “discuss coordinated motion proceedings  
 21 and other case management issues.” (*Play Store MDL*, ECF No. 2). All Parties to the *Epic* and  
 22 *Developer Class Actions* believe the issues presented in the briefs are ripe for decision and are not  
 23 affected by the creation of the Play Store MDL, nor the transfer and consolidation of additional  
 24 tagalong consumer class cases.

1 Consumers filed a Consolidated Amended Complaint on December 28, 2020. Following  
 2 that filing, Consumers and Google agreed to stay dismissal briefing pending the Court's resolution  
 3 of Google's Motion to Dismiss the *Epic* and *Developer Class Action* complaints. (*Consumer Class*  
 4 *Action* ECF No. 138). Unless the Court directs otherwise, Consumers and Google believe it would  
 5 be efficient to first address the fully-briefed dismissal motions now pending before the Court.

6 **Discovery:** The first discovery requests were served by Epic, Developer Plaintiffs, and  
 7 Consumer Plaintiffs on November 9, 2020. Google timely objected to those requests and served  
 8 requests on Epic and Developer Plaintiffs on December 3, 2020 and December 18, 2020  
 9 respectively. Both Epic and Developer Plaintiffs have timely objected to those requests.

10 **Document Production:** The Parties have begun producing documents, with Google's first  
 11 production of over 375,000 pages from its custodial review having occurred yesterday, February  
 12 16, 2021, and advises that a further substantial production is in process for early March. Epic has  
 13 also produced documents, amounting to approximately 1.7 million pages to date. Transactional  
 14 data has not yet been produced. The parties have cooperatively met and conferred to discuss the  
 15 production of transactional data and other documents approximately seven times since November  
 16 2020, and continue to meet and confer, although several discovery issues remain unresolved.

17 **Unresolved Discovery Issues:**

- 18       a. **Custodial Categories:** The Parties continue to negotiate search terms to be run  
       19       over Google's and Epic's custodial collections.
- 20       b. **Validation Protocol:** The Parties continue to discuss whether a validation  
       21       protocol (which would require reviewing a sample of documents to determine  
       22       the percentage of documents hit by search terms that are responsive) is  
       23       appropriate.
- 24       c. **Scope of Time:** The Parties continue to discuss the period searches should  
       25       cover.

**d. Regulatory Investigations:** The Parties continue to discuss whether documents produced in regulatory investigations that implicate any topic at issue here should be produced in this litigation.

e. **Transactional data:** The Parties continue to discuss the production of transactional data that is relevant to class certification and expert issues. The Plaintiffs have prioritized the requested data and have discussed in numerous meet and confers the manner in which such data could be produced. Google indicated that it is still examining how to produce the requested data in a format that is usable by all parties and has committed to work cooperatively with Plaintiffs on an efficient method of pulling transactional data that is acceptable to all Parties.

**f. Consumer Plaintiffs' User Account Activity:** The Parties continue to discuss the collection of data related to the named consumer plaintiffs' device usage, app downloads and user activity.

1 Dated: February 17, 2021

2 CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP  
3 Christine Varney (*pro hac vice*)  
4 Katherine B. Forrest (*pro hac vice*)  
5 Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)  
6 Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)  
8 M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)

9 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH**  
10 **LLP**

11 Paul J. Riehle

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 By: /s/ Yonatan Even  
14 Yonatan Even

15 *Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.*

16 Dated: February 17, 2021

17 BARTLIT BECK LLP  
18 Karma M. Julianelli

19 KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP  
20 Hae Sung Nam

21 Respectfully submitted,

22 By: /s/ Karma M. Julianelli  
23 Karma M. Julianelli

24 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in*  
25 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*  
26 *Litigation*

1 Dated: February 17, 2021

PRITZKER LEVINE LLP  
Elizabeth C. Pritzker

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 By: /s/ Elizabeth C. Pritzker  
4 Elizabeth C. Pritzker

5 *Liaison Counsel for the Proposed Class in*  
6 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*  
7 *Litigation*

8 Dated: February 17, 2021

9 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
10 Steve W. Berman  
11 Robert F. Lopez  
12 Benjamin J. Siegel

13 SPERLING & SLATER PC  
14 Joseph M. Vanek  
15 Eamon P. Kelly  
16 Alberto Rodriguez

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 By: /s/ Steve W. Berman  
19 Steve W. Berman

20 *Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the*  
21 *Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
22 *Pure Sweat Basketball*

1 Dated: February 17, 2021

HAUSFELD LLP  
Bonny E. Sweeney  
Melinda R. Coolidge  
Katie R. Beran  
Scott A. Martin  
Irving Scher

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 By: /s/ Bonny E. Sweeney  
7 Bonny E. Sweeney

8 *Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the*  
9 *Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
10 *Peekya App Services, Inc.*

11 Dated: February 17, 2021

12 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
13 Brian C. Rocca  
14 Sujal J. Shah  
15 Minna L. Naranjo  
16 Rishi P. Satia  
17 Michelle Park Chiu

18 Respectfully submitted,

19 By: /s/ Brian C. Rocca  
20 Brian C. Rocca

21 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

## **E-FILING ATTESTATION**

I, Hae Sung Nam, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has concurred in this filing.

/s/ *Hae Sung Nam*

Hae Sung Nam